DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 465 JC 800 640

AUTHOR Francis, Robert M.
TITLE An Analysis of Student Participation in Governance at Herkimer County Community College with Recommendations for Improvement.
PUB DATE 15 Feb 79
NOTE 58p.: Ed. D. Practicum, Nova University. Marginally reproducible due tc broken print.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Administration: College Faculty: Community Colleges: Decision Making: *Governance: Questionnaires: *Student Attitudes: *Student Government: *Student Participation: Tables (Data): Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

A survey of 50 randomly selected, full-time, day students at Herkimer County Community College, New York, was conducted to identify those areas of college governance that students felt they should be involved in and to determine the percentage of students who actually participated in student government. The students were asked to indicate: (1) their desire for involvement in 27 governance activities, (2) their overall feelings about student participation, and (3) their familiarity and involvement with the college governance structure and its officers. Major findings indicate that while 84% of the students felt that participation in governance "makes a difference," only 2% were actually involved in the governance process. While students did not desire complete control in any area of college administration, they desired at least an equal voice with administrators in 15 of the 27 areas surveyed, including the establishment of degree requirements and the regulation of student conduct. Those areas in which students did not favor strong participation were related to faculty, such as hiring, promotion, and the determination of workload. The study report reviews the literature dealing with student participation in college governance and provides recommendations for increasing that participation. The questionnaire is appended. (JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED196465

AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNANCE AT HERKIMER COUNT COMMUNITY COLLEGE WITH RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

by

Robert M. Francis, M. Ed.

Herkimer County Community College

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

February 15, 1979

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert M. Francis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

JC 800 040

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Statement of the Purpose	1
Significance to Institution	1
Background and Significance	4
2. PROCEDURES	
Definition of Terms	11
Limitations and Assumptions	12
Procedures	13
Results	17
Discussion, Implications, and Recommendations	38
BIBLIOGRAPHY	45
APPENDIX	
A. Questionnaire of Student Participation	47

AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNANCE AT HERKIMER COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE WITH RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

AN ABSTRACT

by

Robert M. Francis

This practicum presents a review of the literature pertaining to student participation in college governance and describes a study conducted in order to determine the attitudes of students at Herkimer County Community College regarding their role in college governance. Fifty randomly selected students were asked to respond to a questionnaire designed to survey their desire for involvement in governance at the college. The results of the survey revealed that students strongly preferred to be involved, but had little knowledge of college governance, and a majority of the students were not currently involved in the governance process. Students did not ask for total control in any area, but they desired at least an equal voice with administrators in 59 percent of the areas surveyed, namely: requirements for degrees and certificates; selection of college officers directly related to student affairs; establishing attendance policies; regulation of student conduct; college calendar revisions or changes; course development and program

changes; faculty evaluations; planning commencement exercises; development of campus physical facilities; student academic probation and supervision policies; setting institutional goals; student publications; distribution of student-initiated literature on campus; coordination and approval of co-curricular activities; allocation of student activities' fees; and provision of services to the community.

The following are the recommendations of this study:

- different approaches to student participation in college governance should be explored for more effective utilization of time;
- an advisory committee should be established to present areas of student interest to the administration;
- incorporation of a newsletter to improve communication between student representatives and the student body.

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Faculty Teaching Loads	18
2.	Requirements for Degrees and Certificates	18
3.	Selection of the College President	19
4.	Selection of College Officers Directly Related to Student Affairs	19
5.	Faculty Hiring (Appointments)	20
6.	Faculty Promotions	20
7.	Faculty Tenure	21
8.	Class Size	21
9.	Allocation of Instructional Funds	22
10.	Establishing Attendance Policies	22
11.	Regulation of Student Conduct	23
12.	College Calendar Revision or Changes	23
13.	Course Development and Program Changes	24
14.	Faculty Salaries	24
15.	Faculty Evaluations	25
16.	Planning Commencement Exercises	25
17.	Establishing Grading Policies	26
18.	Determining Administrative Structure of the College	26
19.	Development of Campus Physical Facilities	27
20.	Student Academic Probation and Supervision Policies	27
21.	Setting Institutional Goals	28

Table		Page
22.	Student Publications	28
23.	Distribution of Student-Initiated Literature on Campus	29
24.	Coordination and Approval of Co-Curricular Activities	29
25.	Allocation of Student Activity Fees	30
26.	Faculty Reappointments	30
27.	Provisions of Services to the Community . . .	31
28.	I Feel that more Student Participation in College Governance is Warranted	31
29.	I Feel that Student Participation in College Governance Makes No Difference in How the College Decisions are Made	32
30.	I Feel that the College Governance is Responsive to the Student Needs	32
31.	I am not that Familiar with the College Governance Structure	32
32.	I am currently Involved in College Governance	33
33.	I have made Suggestions to Student and Faculty Representatives	33
34.	I would like to Share in Planning with the Faculty and Administration for College Governance	34
35.	I am Aware of the Faculty Student Senate's Purpose	34
36.	I am Aware of the Funding Available for Student's Activities through the Faculty Student Senate	34
37.	I would Like to have some Input in the Allocation of Student Activity Funding . .	35

Table		Page
38.	I Would Like Being on a Faculty or Administrative Committee to Investigate Whether Current Student Interests are Being Met	35
39.	I Am Aware of the Approximate Amount of Student Activity Fees Being Allocated to the Various Functions on the Campus	36
40.	I Am Aware of the Name of the College President	36
41.	I Am Aware of the Name of the Dean of the College	36
42.	I Am Aware of the Name of the Dean of Student Services	37
43.	The Reasons that I Do Not Want to Be Involved in College Decision-Making Policies Are	37

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The problem addressed by this practicum was to analyze student participation in governance at Herkimer County Community College with recommendations for improvement.

The purpose of the practicum was to:

1. determine why the students at Herkimer County Community College do or do not actively participate in college governance.
2. determine the percentage of students who actively participate in college governance.
3. determine the areas of college governance that students would like to become involved in.
4. develop and implement recommendations to improve student participation in college governance.

The practicum was significant to the college in helping to analyze the reasons for or against student involvement in college governance and in developing ways to increase student participation in college governance.

There has not been substantial documentation to reflect the fact that students have or have not actively participated in the governance process at Herkimer County Community College. Therefore, this study was needed in order to examine the amount of student participation and how important the students view participation in the governance system at

Herkimer County Community College. It is important for Herkimer County Community College to prevent conflict and to resolve conflict through open communication with all constituencies. One function of management is to anticipate problems. Soliciting opinions and advice from all affected parties is good common sense as evidenced by the review of literature. MacGregor states that:

> . . . student involvement in governance is seen by many administrators as a desirable goal. . . as it serves to reduce disorder due to student activists. And in addition, it is unlikely that the typical community college student will see himself participating in governance unless he sees his role as being effective (MacGregor, 1973, p. 15).

Many faculty and administrators praise the process of participation in student government, but many students castigate the very same process as devoid of substantive meaning or effect (Deegan, 1970, p. 15).

New York's 1975 law mandating student representation on boards of public colleges has had some impact on Herkimer County Community College's governance structure. In a recent article the president of Herkimer County Community College wrote about the controversy that prevails concerning the wisdom of having students participate in college governance. "The intensity of feelings on this issue ranged from hostility and dissatisfaction . . . to feelings of positive reaction. He further pointed out that the majority of board members surveyed agreed with the former conviction while only a minority felt the latter was the case (McLaughlin, 1978, p. 41).

Some of the student trustees elicited the following comments: "I do not have enough time to do a good job. I feel that I am resented and not wanted." In addition, students felt that they were barely tolerated and that without legislative support would not be welcomed. This may be unfortunate, but it is understandable (McLaughlin, 1978, p. 42).

On October 17 - 19, 1978, the Student Senate polls at Herkimer County Community College were open to elect eight Freshman Senators. Only 275 students voted out of 802 eligible students. Eligibility is determined by being a first-year student carrying twelve credits or more. The 275 figure represented only 34 percent of the total freshman class voting. The total student senate budget was approximately $124,000 and approximately one third cared to participate in this vote.

The climate at Herkimer County Community College is currently one of apathy. This may be a direct result of students feeling that college governance is not their responsibility, or that perhaps students feel that their participation is not meaningful and only tokenism. In addition, it may be that the organizational structure at Herkimer County Community College is not adequate for effective communication to allow meaningful student participation because the students may not see themselves as part of the decision-making process.

Whatever the reasons for this climate at Herkimer County Community College, confrontations can be avoided in the future if the student participation has influence regarding matters of greatest interest to them. Therefore, the significance to the institution is one of student involvement and the importance of student involvement with regard to avoiding possible future confrontations concerning student-faculty-administration governance. From the standpoint of the institution, the more self-governance that exists among the student body, the less the need for institutional supervision and the greater the potential for the development of the individual and the institution (Richardson, 1965, p. 34).

Research for this study was conducted on the basis of a survey instrument distributed to fifty students via a random number process. A questionnaire was utilized which consisted of forty-three questions asking the students to indicate their preference for participation in a number of college governance areas. The data collected was displayed in terms of frequency distribution and percentages.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

Richardson and Bender regard governance as "an umbrella term used to encompass the web of communication and decision making which transforms a collectivity of individuals into an organization engaged in purposeful activity" (Richardson, 1977, p. i). The communication and

web of interests between administration and students broke down with the student riots and demonstrations of the 1960s and early 1970s, which called attention to student's interests in the internal affairs of the colleges and universities. However, the extent to which meaningful involvement has been achieved is unknown; although it is known that on many campuses, some students are still willing to play the student-government game, without real responsibility as to purpose (O'Banion and Thurston, 1972, p. 216).

As previously mentioned in the introductory section, the climate at Herkimer County Community College seems to be apathetic, yet the administration provides avenues for expressing student opinions. In addition, the climate seems to be one of little emphasized communication between administration and students. The resultant climate appears to be that of a passive role for the students.

According to Richardson, if the prime objectives of an institution are to be met, student involvement is necessary (Richardson, 1972, p. 66). The climate at Herkimer is not one of student activism, per se, but it is this author's belief that many students at Herkimer County Community College are not aware of the avenues available to them for expressing their ideas. Due to this lack of communication, studerts have developed a role of observer status.

The development of shared authority by faculty, administrators, students, and trustees in college governance undoubtedly requires tolerance, respect, and a community of interest which is directed toward common causes. It is apparent that the roles of the faculty, students, and administrators in campus governance are poorly defined, and that the organizational structures in which these roles are performed are loosely constructed (Hawes and Trux, 1974, p. 123).

More specifically, I. Kenberry thinks that a multiplication of forums at lower levels of administration is needed to produce manageable issues for most active participation by faculty and students (Kenberry, 1970, p. 373). In addition, students should have primary responsibilities for student body activities and regulations pertaining to their own personal lives; they should participate in establishing standards and participate in disciplinary processes; they should be heard, through formal means, on questions involving an institution's budget and its physical resources (Hawes and Trux, 1974, p. 123).

Students should not be content with observer status because their goal as students is not only that of the consumer of higher education, but as co-producers as well (Bond, 1974, p. 133). Since community colleges have grown so in numbers, size, enrollment, and complexity over the past decade, it has become important that a delineation of student roles in the involvement of governance be developed

in community colleges. Bond has stated that a participatory governance model should be developed to involve students in the following areas: (Bond, 1974, p. 133)

1. the place of student-conducted evaluation of teaching in the faculty promotion and review process;
2. student participation in academic committees;
3. the student role in academic planning and curriculum review processes;
4. class size and the diversity and frequency of course offerings;
5. grading policies;
6. allocation of income from student fees;
7. staffing;
8. management of student services.

It is the contention of this writer that meaningful participation in college governance is not guaranteed just by the involvement of students on various standing and ad hoc committees. In some cases, several problems have arisen as the result of student-faculty-administration conflict. Hubbell states (Hubbell, 1970, pp. 29-43):

1. Students primarily play a protesting role and turn committee membership into a setting for the acting out of authority problems;
2. Complex problems of administration are dealt with in a very superficial manner in joint student-faculty groups, and the real problem-solving is done later by faculty and administration;

3. Inordinate amounts of time are spent trying to brief student members on the issues involved;

4. Students feel inadequate to deal with the issues or with the adults and soon lose motivation to participate further and withdraw either physically or psychologically from collegiate community activities.

What the more thoughtful and restless students are requesting is not that academic decisions be turned over to student mobs, but that they be allowed, through democratic channels, to express their views about matters of greatest interest to them (Howe, 1965, p. 16). The delivery of educational services to a community serviced by the community college is the prime objective of the institution and that if the prime objective is to be met, student involvement is essential (Richardson, 1972, p. 66).

It is essential for institutions to utilize all of its resources fully, and the students are a resource. Therefore, the involvement of all constituencies in achieving institutional goals, developing new programs, and evaluation of institutional achievements can be a powerful force in shaping congruence and new organizational changes (Richardson, 1972, p. 66).

The Committee for Economic Development has stated that the future of the management effectiveness of colleges and universities depends a great deal upon the role of the students in making decisions on matters directly affecting them (Lombardi, 1973, p. 16).

Student participation in governance is seen by many administrators as a desirable goal, not only for the widely recognized view that it affords the students experience but that it also serves to reduce disorders due to student activists (MacGregor, 1973, p. 15).

The Carnegie Commission is generally sympathetic toward greater participation in those areas of governance where students have substantial interest and adequate competence and where they will assume responsibility. The Carnegie Commission believes that there are areas where the students can inform the decision-making agencies about their experiences and desires, give good advice, exercise good judgment, and support innovation (Carnegie Commission, 1973, p. 68).

Research conducted by the Carnegie Commission indicates that:

> Some of the most valuable contributions of student participation can be at the departmental level. Students should be involved in governance to the extent--which in some areas can be significant--that they contribute to the quality of decisions and to the overall performance of the campus, and not on the basis of descriptive tactics. Students should now be incorporated more fully into the ongoing decision-making processes on campus within the limits of their interest, their competence, and their ability to take responsibility.(Carnegie Commission, 1973, p. 72).

As one student recently stated in a letter to his school newspaper about the causes of student unrest: "We are angry because we are powerless. We have no voice in

the forces which so completely control our lives"(The Culture of the University, 1968, p. 10).

Tokenism and ineffective student government are no longer alternatives. As a recent report stated: "A tokenism which offers the promise but withholds the substance of participation can only worsen the situation"(The Culture of the University, 1968, p. 6).

It is the belief of Deegan and others that:

> . . . changes in the nature of the structure and the context in which decisions are made do much to help mitigate potential conflict and polarization. The present structures in many of our colleges either do not provide for any effective student voice in decision making or set the stage for confrontations of rigid interest groups who have had little prior consultation, communication, or information (Deegan, 1970, p. 219).

The importance of meaningful student involvement in college governance is reflected in a paper by Richardson when he stated:

> It has been pointed out that the zone of acceptance for policies which result in effective action broadens as those who are affected participate in their determination. We know, too, that authority in an organization is dependent upon the assent of those governed. From these two statements we may conclude that if we are to achieve acceptance by students of organizational policies, we will need to involve them in the development of such policies or run the risk of arriving at conclusions that are unacceptable to those whom they are designed to serve (Richardson, 1969, p. 35).

Chapter 2

DEFINITION OF TERMS

During the course of this study reference was made to the terms cited below. These terms, along with their appropriate definition, should be helpful in understanding the intent and purpose of this study as well as assisting in the interpretation of the results. The terms are listed below in alphabetic order:

College governance - the web of communication and decision making which transforms a collectivity of individuals into an organization engaged in purposeful activity (Richardson, 1977, p. i).

Decision making - students sharing with the administration and/or the faculty in the process of determining who gets what, when and how (Lasswell, 1958, p. 25).

Full-time day student - one who is enrolled for at least twelve semester hours of credit.

Part-time student - one who is enrolled for less than twelve semester hours of credit.

Process - a series of events or tasks necessary to accomplish basic goals.

Random Number Generator Program - a computer program designed to select a given number of items or individuals on a random basis.

Student Participation - students taking part in matters concerning and/or affecting the students.

Student's Role - a position that a student takes in the decision-making process.

Student Senate - the student governing body that is elected by the student population whose purpose is decision making in areas of student concerns.

LIMITATIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS

In considering the intent and scope of this study, the reader should be aware of the following limitations:

1. The technique of random sampling was used via a random number generator computer program.
2. The study was limited to full-time day students. Part-time students, or evening students were not considered.
3. The study did not consider the moderator variables of the respondent. Variables such as age, sex, career goals, past educational or employment experiences, and marital status were not considered. These variables could have affected the outcomes being considered.

The following are the basic assumptions of this study:

1. The sampling technique used provided a representative sample of the current full-time day student population.
2. The questionnaire was an accurate measure of student perceptions.
3. Evening and part-time students represent a different population in terms of their perceptions of college governance, therefore, they were eliminated from this study.
4. It is assumed that the reliability and validity of Part I of the questionnaire was established as it was adapted from an instrument designed by O'Banion and Thurston and utilized previously in a study by Lord (O'Banion and Thurston, 1972, p. 59 and Lord, 1978).
5. It is assumed that the data obtained in Part II of the questionnaire was both reliable and valid as it was administered to three administrators, three faculty members, a technical assistant, and ten students in order to test for clarity of language before it was administered to the fifty students who were randomly selected for this study.

PROCEDURES

The procedures followed in the analysis of student participation were:

1. A review of literature related to the importance of student involvement in college governance.
2. A two-part questionnaire was developed and utilized to ascertain students' perceptions regarding their role and their desire for involvement in college governance.
3. Prior to submitting the questionnaire to the final population, the questionnaire was administered to three administrators, three faculty members, a technical assistant, and ten students to test for language ambiguity. Some refinement was necessary.
4. Part I of the questionnaire, consisting of 27 items, was adapted from an instrument designed by O'Banion and Thurston, and utilized previously in a study by Lord (O'Banion and Thurston, 1972, p. 59 and Lord, 1978). The second part of the questionnaire, consisting of 16 items was designed by this writer. After a review of the questionnaire by three administrators, three faculty members, a technical assistant, and ten

students, suggestions pursuant to the instrument were accepted and incorp rated.

5. In Part I of the questionnaire the students were asked to indicate their desire for involvement in each of the 27 college activities, by selecting one of five choices:

   (a) No Student Participation

   (b) Some Student Participation

   (c) Equal Student Participation

   (d) Mostly Student Participation

   (e) All Student Participation

   In Part II of the questionnaire the students were asked to indicate their feelings regarding their own role concerning governance in 16 areas, by selecting one of two choices:

   Yes or No with space available for student comments.

6. In order that the sample population be representative of the student population, it was decided to select fifty students at random from the full-time day student population at Herkimer County Community College. The total student population available for this study comprised 1200 full-time day students. The student sample of 50 was selected by a random number computer program. Each student in the college is listed in an

alpha order index with Herkimer County Community College's Student Services. Numbers were assigned from 1 to 1200 to the alpha listing. A series of numbers was printed at random and the first 50 numbers were obtained. Any duplicate numbers were omitted until the sample of 50 was obtained.

7. The following instructions were given to the 50 students: You have been selected from a random process of the full-time day student population to participate in a study of student involvement in college governance. Your assistance in completing this survey is appreciated. All 50 students originally selected were receptive to answering the survey. In addition, students were instructed not to sign their name and, therefore, all responses were confidential.
8. The 50 students were contacted by this writer and requested to meet at a specified time. Students who were not present at that meeting were contacted by this writer and asked to complete the questionnaire by mail. Follow-up efforts continued until responses were obtained from all 50 students.

RESULTS

The analysis of student participation in governance at Herkimer County Community College was accomplished by the use of a questionnaire. The population was 50 students selected randomly from the full-time day population at Herkimer County Community College. The results of the questionnaire were analyzed and displayed in terms of frequency and percentage response to each category for each question. Each table was numbered in the order in which the items were presented on the questionnaire, and the title of the table reflected the question asked. A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix A.

Concerning the questionnaire, the students were given the following instructions:

> Indicate your response below that best describes your feelings about the degree of student participation you would like to see on this campus.
>
> Column A. = No Student Participation
>
> Column B. = Some Student Participation
>
> Column C. = Equal Student Participation
>
> Column D. = Mostly Student Participation
>
> Column E. = All Student Participation

QUESTIONNAIRE OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION: PART I

Table 1

FACULTY TEACHING LOADS

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	5	29	13	3	0
Percentage	10	58	26	6	0

Table 1 shows that 10 percent (5 students) did not want any involvement, while 58 percent (29 students) desired some involvement; 26 percent (13 students) wanted equal involvement, and another 6 percent (3 students) would like to see mostly student control. No student wanted complete control.

Table 2

REQUIREMENTS FOR DEGREES AND CERTIFICATES

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	1	22	20	5	2
Percentage	2	44	40	10	4

In observing Table 2 it can be seen that 2 percent (1 student) wanted no involvement, while 44 percent (22 students) wanted some involvement, 40 percent (20 students) wanted equal participation, 10 percent (5 students) wanted mostly student control and only 4 percent (2 students) wanted all student control.

Table 3

SELECTION OF THE COLLEGE PRESIDENT

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	11	18	13	5	3
Percentage	22	36	26	10	6

Table 3 reveals that 22 percent (11 students) favored no participation, 36 percent (18 students) favored some participation, 26 percent (13 students) favored equal involvement, 10 percent (5 students) believed that the selection should be mostly student controlled and 6 percent (3 students) favored that the selection should be all student controlled.

Table 4

SELECTION OF COLLEGE OFFICERS DIRECTLY RELATED TO STUDENT AFFAIRS

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	3	7	21	12	7
Percentage	6	14	42	24	14

In Table 4 it can be seen that 6 percent (3 students) favored no participation, 14 percent (7 students) favored some participation, 42 percent (21 students) preferred to have an equal involvement, 24 percent (12 students) preferred to have mostly student control, while 14 percent (7 students) desired all student control.

Table 5

FACULTY HIRING (APPOINTMENTS)

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	32	11	7	0	0
Percentage	64	22	14	0	0

Table 5 reveals that 64 percent (32 students) do not desire to be involved in the faculty hiring process, while 22 percent (11 students) prefer to have some control, and 14 percent (7 students) desired an equal voice. No students wanted to be mostly or all student control of the faculty hiring process.

Table 6

FACULTY PROMOTIONS

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	9	22	16	3	0
Percentage	18	44	32	6	0

Table 6 shows that 18 percent (9 students) desired no student involvement, 44 percent (22 students) chose to have some involvement and 32 percent (16 students) favored equal student involvement; 6 percent (3 students) asked that faculty promotions be mostly student controlled and no students recommended all student control.

Table 7

FACULTY TENURE

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	9	17	21	2	1
Percentage	18	34	42	4	2

Table 7 reveals that 18 percent (9 students) favored no student involvement, 34 percent (17 students) preferred some involvement and 42 percent (21 students) chose to have equal student involvement; 4 percent (2 students) desired to have mostly student control and just 2 percent (1 student) recommended all student control.

Table 8

CLASS SIZE

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	8	19	19	3	1
Percentage	16	38	38	6	2

Table 8 reveals that 16 percent (8 students) favored no student involvement, 38 percent (19 students) preferred some involvement and 38 percent (19 students) chose to have equal involvement; 6 percent (3 students) desired to have mostly student control and just 2 percent (1 student) recommended all student control.

Table 9

ALLOCATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL FUNDS

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	7	23	17	3	0
Percentage	14	46	34	6	0

The inspection of Table 9 shows that, of the fifty students responding, 14 percent (7 students) believed that students should not be involved in the allocation of instructional funds and 46 percent (23 students) preferred to have some student participation; 34 percent (17 students) desired at least equal involvement, 6 percent (3 students) favored mostly student control and no students recommended all student control.

Table 10

ESTABLISHING ATTENDANCE POLICIES

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	2	10	29	7	2
Percentage	4	20	58	14	4

Inspection of Table 10 reveals that only 4 percent (2 students) recommended no involvement and all student control; 20 percent (10 students) favored some involvement, while 58 percent (29 students) desired equal participation and 14 percent (7 students) recommended mostly student participation.

Table 11

REGULATION OF STUDENT CONDUCT

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	1	10	31	7	1
Percentage	2	20	62	14	2

Table 11 illustrates that only 2 percent (1 student) preferred no participation or all student participation in the regulation of student conduct; 20 percent (10 students) desired to have some, whereas 62 percent (31 students) favored equal participation and 14 percent (7 students) recommended mostly student control.

Table 12

COLLEGE CALENDAR REVISION OR CHANGES

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	3	20	20	6	1
Percentage	6	40	40	12	2

In observing Table 12 it can be seen that 6 percent (3 students) favored no participation while 40 percent (20 students) recommended some or equal student participation in the college calendar revisions or changes; 12 percent (6 students) chose mostly student control and only 2 percent (1 student) preferred to have all student control.

Table 13

COURSE DEVELOPMENT AND PROGRAM CHANGES

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	3	21	21	5	0
Percentage	6	42	42	10	0

Inspection of Table 13 shows that 6 percent (3 students) wanted no participation and no student wanted all student participation in the development of courses and college programs; 42 percent (21 students) advocated some or equal student participation and 10 percent (5 students) recommended mostly student control.

Table 14

FACULTY SALARIES

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	39	7	4	0	0
Percentage	78	14	8	0	0

Table 14 shows that 78 percent (39 students) were opposed to any student participation, 14 percent (7 students) favored some, while 8 percent (4 students) preferred equal participation in determining faculty salaries. No students were interested in either mostly or all student control.

Table 15

FACULTY EVALUATIONS

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	5	15	20	9	1
Percentage	10	30	40	18	2

Inspection of Table 15 shows that 10 percent (5 students) were against student participation, while 30 percent (15 students) favored some involvement and 40 percent (20 students) sought equal participation in faculty evaluations; 18 percent (9 students) felt that faculty evaluations should be mostly student controlled and 2 percent (1 student) preferred all student control.

Table 16

PLANNING COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	1	9	19	14	7
Percentage	2	18	38	28	14

Table 16 illustrates that only 2 percent (1 student) chose to select no student participation, with 18 percent (9 students) agreeing to have some involvement, while 38 percent (19 students) favored equal participation; 28 percent (14 students) felt that it should be mostly student controlled and 14 percent (7 students) wanted all student control.

Table 17

ESTABLISHING GRADING POLICIES

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	4	22	19	3	2
Percentage	8	44	38	6	4

Inspection of Table 17 shows that 8 percent (4 students) were against any student involvement, 44 percent (22 students) favored some student involvement and 38 percent (19 students) desired equal student participation in establishing grading policies; 6 percent (3 students) preferred to have grading policies mostly under student control while 4 percent (2 students) recommended all student control.

Table 18

DETERMINING ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE OF THE COLLEGE

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	14	16	20	0	0
Percentage	28	32	40	0	0

Table 18 reveals that 28 percent (14 students) preferred no student participation, 32 percent (16 students) preferred some student involvement, while 40 percent (20 students) advocated equal student participation in determining the administrative structure of the college. No students recommended mostly or all student control in determining the administrative structure of the college.

Table 19

DEVELOPMENT OF CAMPUS PHYSICAL FACILITIES

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	3	13	22	11	1
Percentage	6	26	44	22	2

Table 19 illustrates that 6 percent (3 students) desired no student participation, 26 percent (13 students) preferred at least some student participation, while 44 percent (22 students) favored equal student participation; 22 percent (11 students) considered mostly student control, and 2 percent (1 student) desired all student control of campus physical facilities.

Table 20

STUDENT ACADEMIC PROBATION AND SUPERVISION POLICIES

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	3	21	22	4	0
Percentage	6	42	44	8	0

Inspection of Table 20 reveals that only 6 percent (3 students) preferred no student participation and no student recommended all student control; 42 percent (21 students) favored some student participation, 44 percent (22 students) desired equal student participation and 8 percent (4 students) recommended mostly student control.

Table 21

SETTING INSTITUTIONAL GOALS

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	3	14	24	7	2
Percentage	6	28	48	14	4

Table 21 shows that 6 percent (3 students) preferred to have no student participation, 28 percent (14 students) preferred some student participation, while 48 percent (24 students) advocated equal participation in setting institutional goals; 14 percent (7 students) favored mostly student control and 4 percent (2 students) wanted all student control.

Table 22

STUDENT PUBLICATIONS

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	0	8	10	23	9
Percentage	0	16	20	46	18

In Table 22 it is seen that no student wanted to have no student participation, 16 percent (8 students) wanted to have some student participation, 20 percent (10 students) desired equal student participation, 46 percent (23 students) wanted student publications to be mostly student controlled, and 18 percent (9 students) desired all student control.

Table 23

DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENT-INITIATED LITERATURE ON CAMPUS

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	2	3	13	23	9
Percentage	4	6	26	46	18

Table 23 shows that 4 percent (2 students) preferred to have no student participation, 6 percent (3 students) desired to have some, 26 percent (13 students) favored equal participation, 46 percent (23 students) advocated mostly student control and 18 percent (9 students) desired all student control.

Table 24

COORDINATION AND APPROVAL OF CO-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	0	4	25	17	4
Percentage	0	8	50	34	8

In Table 24 it can be seen that no student wanted to have no student participation, 8 percent (4 students) chose to have some student participation, 50 percent (25 students) advocated equal student participation in the coordination and approval of co-curricular activities; 34 percent (17 students) supported mostly student control and 8 percent (4 students) favored all student control.

Table 25

ALLOCATION OF STUDENT ACTIVITY FEES

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	1	12	15	16	6
Percentage	2	24	30	32	12

Inspection of Table 25 illustrates that only 2 percent (1 student) favored no student participation, 24 percent (12 students) looked for some student participation, and 30 percent (15 students) advocated equal participation; 32 percent (16 students) desired mostly student control and 12 percent (6 students) preferred all student control.

Table 26

FACULTY REAPPOINTMENTS

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	11	26	10	1	2
Percentage	22	52	20	2	4

Table 26 illustrates that 22 percent (11 students) preferred not to have any participation, 52 percent (26 students) advocated some student participation, 20 percent (10 students) desired an equal participation, 2 percent (1 student) favored mostly student control and 4 percent (2 students) wanted all student control.

Table 27

PROVISIONS OF SERVICES TO THE COMMUNITY

	No	Some	Equal	Mostly	All
Frequency	3	15	29	3	0
Percentage	6	30	58	6	0

Table 27 illustrates that 6 percent (3 students) favored no student participation, 30 percent (15 students) preferred some student participation, 58 percent (29 students) advocated an equal participation, 6 percent (3 students) desired mostly student control and no student wanted all student control.

Table 28

I FEEL THAT MORE STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN COLLEGE GOVERNANCE IS WARRANTED

	Yes	No
Frequency	36	14
Percentage	72	28

Table 28 illustrates that 72 percent (36 students) favored more student participation and 28 percent (14 students) desired to select no more student participation in college governance.

Table 29

I FEEL THAT STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN COLLEGE GOVERNANCE MAKES NO DIFFERENCE IN HOW THE COLLEGE DECISIONS ARE MADE

	Yes	No
Frequency	8	42
Percentage	16	84

Observation of Table 29 illustrates that only 16 percent (8 students) agree with the statement while 84 percent (42 students) disagreed with the statement.

Table 30

I FEEL THAT THE COLLEGE GOVERNANCE IS RESPONSIVE TO THE STUDENT NEEDS

	Yes	No
Frequency	42	8
Percentage	84	16

Table 30 illustrates that 84 percent (42 students) responded favorably with the statement while 16 percent (8 students) disagreed with the statement.

Table 31

I AM NOT THAT FAMILIAR WITH THE COLLEGE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

	Yes	No
Frequency	34	16
Percentage	68	32

Table 31 illustrates that 68 percent (34 students) agreed with the statement and 32 percent (16 students) disagreed with the statement.

Table 32

I AM CURRENTLY INVOLVED IN COLLEGE GOVERNANCE

	Yes	No
Frequency	1	49
Percentage	2	98

Table 32 illustrates that only 2 percent (1 student) is currently involved in college governance, while 98 percent (49 students) are not currently involved.

Table 33

I HAVE MADE SUGGESTIONS TO STUDENT AND FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES

	Yes	No
Frequency	5	45
Percentage	10	90

In observing Table 33 it can be seen that 10 percent (5 students) agreed with the statement and 90 percent (45 students) responded no to the statement.

Table 34

I WOULD LIKE TO SHARE IN PLANNING WITH
THE FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION FOR COLLEGE GOVERNANCE

	Yes	No
Frequency	18	32
Percentage	36	64

Table 34 reveals that 36 percent (18 students) agreed with the statement and 64 percent (32 students) did not agree.

Table 35

I AM AWARE OF THE FACULTY STUDENT SENATE'S PURPOSE

	Yes	No
Frequency	18	32
Percentage	36	64

Table 35 reveals that only 36 percent (18 students) are aware of the Faculty Student Senate's Purpose while 64 percent (32 students) are not.

Table 36

I AM AWARE OF THE FUNDING AVAILABLE FOR STUDENT'S
ACTIVITIES THROUGH THE FACULTY STUDENT SENATE

	Yes	No
Frequency	15	35
Percentage	30	70

Table 36 reveals that 30 percent (15 students) are aware of the activity funding through the Faculty Student Senate while 70 percent (35 students) are not.

Table 37

I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE SOME INPUT IN THE ALLOCATION OF STUDENT ACTIVITY FUNDING

	Yes	No
Frequency	32	18
Percentage	64	36

Table 37 reveals that 64 percent (32 students) agree with the statement and 36 percent (18 students) disagreed with having some input in the allocation of student activity funding.

Table 38

I WOULD LIKE BEING ON A FACULTY OR ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE WHETHER CURRENT STUDENT INTERESTS ARE BEING MET

	Yes	No
Frequency	24	26
Percentage	48	52

Table 38 reveals that 48 percent (24 students) agree with the statement, while 52 percent (26 students) disagree with the statement.

Table 39

I AM AWARE OF THE APPROXIMATE AMOUNT OF STUDENT ACTIVITY FEES BEING ALLOCATED TO THE VARIOUS FUNCTIONS ON THE CAMPUS

	Yes	No
Frequency	10	40
Percentage	20	80

Table 39 shows that 20 percent (10 students) are aware of the approximate amount of student activity fees being allocated to the various functions on the campus while 80 percent (40 students) are not.

Table 40

I AM AWARE OF THE NAME OF THE COLLEGE PRESIDENT

	Yes	No
Frequency	30	20
Percentage	60	40

Table 40 reveals that 60 percent (30 students) are aware of the name of the college president while 40 percent (20 students) are not.

Table 41

I AM AWARE OF THE NAME OF THE COLLEGE DEAN

	Yes	No
Frequency	34	16
Percentage	68	32

Table 41 reveals that 68 percent (34 students) are aware of the name of the college Dean while 32 percent (16 students) are not.

Table 42

I AM AWARE OF THE NAME OF THE DEAN OF STUDENT SERVICES

	Yes	No
Frequency	24	26
Percentage	48	52

Table 42 reveals that 48 percent (24 students) are aware of the name of the Dean of Student Services while 52 percent (26 students) are not.

Table 43

CONCERNING ITEM 43, THE REASONS THAT I DO NOT WANT TO BE INVOLVED IN COLLEGE DECISION-MAKING POLICIES ARE:

- 12 percent (6 students) provided no reasons;
- 68 percent (34 students) did not know that much about college policy making and did not know how to go about getting involved;
- 10 percent (5 students) stated that being commuting students interfered with their time to become involved;
- 4 percent (2 students) were employed;
- 6 percent (3 students) stated that school work was more important than becoming involved.

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Analysis of the results from the questionnaire shows that the students surveyed at Herkimer County Community College want to participate in college governance. A majority of the students favored participation in 59 percent of the following areas surveyed, namely: requirements for degrees and certificates; selection of the college officers directly related to student affairs; establishing attendance policies; regulation of student conduct; college calendar revisions or changes; course development and program changes; faculty evaluations; planning commencement exercises; development of campus physical facilities; student academic probation and supervision policies; setting institutional goals; student publications; distribution of student-initiated literature on campus; coordination and approval of co-curricular activities; allocation of student activity fees; and, provision of services to the community.

The areas where students did not favor strong participation were related to situations closely connected to faculty involvement with the institutions, namely: faculty teaching loads; selection of the college president; faculty hiring; faculty promotions and tenure; class size; allocation of instructional funds; determining the administrative structure of the college; faculty salaries and re-appointments.

The only exception was that a stronger participation was desired in the evaluation of the faculty. In addition, the results revealed that in the areas affecting student concerns, the students showed a strong desire to be a part of the decision-making process.

In no area did a majority of the students ask for total control in college governance. Instead, they were highly in favor of a shared participation in matters affecting them. The results of this study parallel those of a similar survey conducted at Gaston Community College by Jones, cited in Lord, 1978, so far as the areas in which students demonstrated a preference for participation.

The students surveyed at Herkimer County Community College responded strongly in favor of an interest in participating in college governance, particularly in those areas that directly or indirectly affect them.

While the results of the first twenty-seven questions illustrate that students desire participation in college governance, the results of the last sixteen questions reveal that 68 percent of the students have little knowledge about the governance process.

It is interesting to note that the results show that:

- 72 percent feel that more student participation is warranted;
- 84 percent of the students believe that student participation makes a difference;

- 98 percent are not currently involved in the governance process;
- 90 percent have not made suggestions to the Student Senate;
- 64 percent would not like to share in planning with faculty and administration;
- 52 percent would not like to be on a committee to investigate whether current student interests are being met.

It would appear that the interest is there, according to this study, yet the current methods of implementation and/or communication need to be reviewed.

Students are appointed by the administration to a majority of the committees at Herkimer County Community College; yet few students actually attend the meetings. The results of the questionnaire show that the students feel that student participation does make a difference, yet 98 percent (49 students) are not currently involved in college governance. Therefore, there is a situation at Herkimer County Community College whereby students know very little about college governance and do not participate, yet, they believe that students should participate.

It would appear that the students believe that student participation does have an impact on college governance, but according to question 43, there are some important considerations for not being involved. Some of the most important reasons are the following:

- 68 percent (34 students) did not know that much about the college governance structure and they did not know how to go about getting involved;
- 10 percent of the students surveyed considered commuting time to be a factor for not getting involved in college governance;
- 4 percent were employed;
- 6 percent considered school work to be more important than becoming involved;
- 12 percent gave no reason(s) for not wanting to be involved in college governance.

In addition, the study also showed that:

- 70 percent (35 students) were not familiar with the funding available for student activities;
- 80 percent (40 students) were not aware of the allocation of student activity fees.

This does not appear to be a healthy situation for students since they feel that student participation is necessary and that their input does make a difference in how the college is run, but in reality, they do not participate. Therefore, there is a need to find different approaches in order to encourage more student participation.

Based upon the results of this study, this author makes the following recommendations regarding student participation in governance at Herkimer County Community College:

1. Different approaches to student participation in college governance should be explored. The time factor should be given special consideration because the results of this study show that many students are working, or need more study time, or are commuting, or are busy in other areas.
2. An advisory committee should be established by the Student Senate, the make up of which could best be defined by the Student Senate, for students to be able to present their interest in areas where they have asked for participation and where participation would be most meaningful.
3. Steps should be taken to improve communication with all students. Three questions were asked to determine whether or not students were familiar with the names of the college's officials. If the students did not know the names of the College President, the Dean of the College, and the Dean of Student Services, one could infer that these same students would not be familiar with the college governance structure. Sixty percent of the students surveyed knew the name of the President of the College, 68 percent knew the name of the Dean of the College, yet only 48 percent knew the name of the Dean of Student Services, the one person that all students should be familiar with.

Careful consideration of the following points should be made:

1. Publishing a student newsletter or utilizing the current school newspaper to inform the students of the importance of their becoming involved in college governance. In this way the students c uld be informed of the names of their representatives, their stand on decisions, their attendance rate and the consequences of their decisions. In addition, the newsletter or newspaper could be the communication for informing students about how to get involved and other "How To's." It is important, also, that the student understand his role, and the environments in which the college operates, i.e., local sponsors, budgetary constraints; the newsletter/newspaper can be a valuable communicative tool for such purposes.
2. Efforts should be made to increase the student's awareness regarding the college governance structure and the importance of their participation. This could be accomplished by holding "campus meetings" at the college activity time, already designated from 12:30 to 2:00 every Tuesday and Thursday afternoons.

Based upon the above recommendations a new organizational structure should emerge that would encourage students to participate more actively in college governance. Perhaps a more streamlined approach with the Student Senate should emerge that would take into consideration the importance of time management for the students at Herkimer County Community College. In addition, the potential for better communication between the administrators and the students to present ways that students can become more involved could promise new governance models for internal participation.

The above recommendations may permit new models for college governance at Herkimer County Community College that would not only provide additional avenues for increased student expression, but would openly encourage student participation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Psychological Association, Publication Manual. 2d. ed. Washington: The Association, 1974.

Bond, L. Impact of Collective Bargaining on Students, Current issues in higher education, Vol. 29, 1974.

The Carnegie Commission of Higher Education. Governance of higher education, New York: McGraw-Hill, April 1973.

The culture of the university: Governance and education. Report of the Study Commission on University Governance, University of California, Berkeley, 1968.

Deegan, W. and others. Student Participation in Governance, The junior college journal, November 1970.

Hawes, L. and Trux, H. R., IV. Student Participation in the University Decision-Making Process, Journal of higher education, Vol. XLV, No. 2, February 1974.

Howe, I. Berkeley and Beyond, The new republic, May 1, 1965.

Hubbell, R. N. Increasing Awareness, College and university business, June 1970.

Kenberry, S. O. I. Restructuring the Governance of Higher Education, AAUP bulletin, December 1970.

Lasswell, H. Politics: Who gets what, when, how? New York: World Publishing Company, 1958.

Lombardi, J. Management and financing of colleges, The Committee for Economic Development, October 1973.

Lord, J. A survey of the student opinions at Everett Community College regarding the student's role in college governance, Fort Lauderdale: NOVA University, 1978.

MacGregor, A. How to Strengthen Your Student Government, College management, April 1973.

McLaughlin, R. Inside Student Trusteeship, A.G.B. reports, September/October 1978.

O'Banion, T. and Thurston, A. Student development programs in the community junior college, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Richardson, R. C., Jr. Recommendations on Student Rights and Freedoms, Community and junior college journal, American Association of Junior Colleges, February 1969.

Richardson, R. C., Jr. and Bender, L. W. College governance, Fort Lauderdale: NOVA University, Second Edition, December 1977.

Richardson, R. C., Jr. and others. Governance for the two-year college. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Tuckman, B. W. Conducting educational research, New York: Harcourt-Brace, Inc., 1972.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION: PART I

Indicate your response below that best describes your feelings about the degree of student participation you would like to see on this campus.

Column A = No Student Participation
Column B = Some Student Participation
Column C = Equal Student Participation
Column D = Mostly Student Participation
Column E = All Student Participation

	A No	B Some	C Equal	D Mostly	E All
1. Faculty teaching loads					
2. Requirements for degrees and certificates					
3. Selection of the college president					
4. Selection of college officers directly related to student affairs					
5. Faculty hiring (appointments)					
6. Faculty promotion					
7. Faculty tenure					
8. Class size					
9. Allocation of instructional funds					
10. Establishing attendance policies					

	A No	B Some	C Equal	D Mostly	E All
11. Regulation of student conduct					
12. College calendar revision or changes					
13. Course development and program changes					
14. Faculty salaries					
15. Faculty evaluations					
16. Planning commencement exercises					
17. Establishing grading policies					
18. Determining administrative structure of the college					
19. Development of campus physical facilities					
20. Student academic probation and supervision policies					
21. Setting institutional goals					
22. Student publications					
23. Distribution of student-initiated literature on campus					
24. Coordination and approval of co-curricular activities					
25. Allocation of student activity fees					
26. Faculty reappointments					
27. Provision of services to the community					

QUESTIONNAIRE OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION: PART II

		Yes	No
28.	I feel that more student participation in college governance is warranted. Comment _____		
29.	I feel that student participation in college governance makes no difference in how the college decisions are made. Comment _____		
30.	I feel that the college governance is responsive to student needs. Comment _____		
31.	I am not that familiar with the college governance structure. Comment _____		
32.	I am currently involved in college governance. Comment _____		
33.	I have made suggestions to Student and Faculty Representatives. Comment _____		
34.	I would like to share in planning with the faculty and administration for college governance. Comment _____		
35.	I am aware of the Faculty Student Senate's purpose. Comment _____		
36.	I am aware of the funding available for student's activities through the Faculty Student Senate. Comment _____		

	Yes	No
37. I would like to have some input in the allocation of student activity funding. Comment _____		
38. I would like being on a faculty or administrative committee to investigate whether current student interests are being met. Comment _____		
39. I am aware of the approximate amount of student activity fees being allocated to the various functions on the campus. Comment _____		
40. I am aware of the name of the College President. Comment _____		
41. I am aware of the name of the College Dean. Comment _____		
42. I am aware of the name of the Dean of Student Services. Comment _____		
43. The reasons that I do not want to be involved in College decision-making policies are: _____ _____ _____ _____ _____		

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024

JAN 23 1981